

MINI-INSTANTONS IN SU(2) GAUGE THEORY

Vincenzo Branchina^a and Janos Polonyi^{b c}

*Laboratory of Theoretical Physics
Department of Physics
Louis Pasteur University
67087 Strasbourg Cedex France*

ABSTRACT

The effects of instantons close to the cut-off is studied in four dimensional SU(2) gauge theory with higher order derivative terms in the action. It is found in the framework of the dilute instanton gas approximation that the convergence of the topological observables requires non-universal beta function.

^a branchina@crnvax.in2p3.fr

^b polonyi@fresnel.u-strasbg.fr

^c On leave from L. Eötvös University, Budapest, Hungary

Only renormalizable Quantum Field Theory models are considered in Particle Physics. This was explained traditionally by inspecting the UV divergences generated by the operators in the framework of the perturbation expansion on a homogeneous background field. The non-renormalizable theories were rejected due to the need of infinitely many coupling constants. This argument has been further developed in the last decades. First it came the realization that what really matters in Particle Physics is not the true UV divergence because one always works with effective theories in the lacking of definite knowledge of the Theory of Everything. The characterization of the operators according to the renormalizability was replaced by the procedure of identifying their importance at low energies. In particular, the equivalence of the renormalizability of an operator with its relevance at the UV fixed point of the theory has been established [1]. The non-renormalizable operators were excluded in this manner because they do not change the universality class, i.e. their influence on the dynamics decreases as we move away from the UV fixed point towards the physical energy scales. An important feature of this new characterization of the class of important operators is that it is based on one scaling regime, that of the UV fixed point. It may happen that there are other scaling regimes as we move towards the IR and certain non-renormalizable operators become relevant there [2]. One should include these operators in the description of the physics at finite energies. The second improvement in defining the class of acceptable theories of Particle Physics came by extending the computation of the scaling laws of the UV fixed point beyond the realm of the perturbation expansion. The usual strategy is to take the anomalous dimensions into account in the power counting argument [3]. New relevant operators of the UV fixed point can be found in this manner and the class of parameters which characterize the physics of a given particle content is enlarged.

The physical picture of the strong coupling massless QED vacuum [4] which served as the motivation of Ref. [3] is based on the observation that the positronium may acquire negative energy and collapse onto the size of the cut-off when $e = O(1)$. The condensate of these bound states breaks the chiral symmetry and the resulting vacuum is modified in the IR domain when compared to the perturbative one. A slight modification of this scenario, namely the generation of a phase transition by localized coherent states at the cut-off has been suggested in Refs. [5], [6].

The aim of this Letter is to show that these coherent states, namely the solutions of the equation of motion in the presence of higher derivative terms, modify the physics in a manner which is not predicted by the usual power counting based on the expansion around a locally flat background field. The important point is that this is a *tree level* effect which is due to the sensitivity of these solutions to the presence of the higher order derivative terms in the action. The usual power counting method and its more sophisticated version the, decoupling theorem [7], are constructed from the very beginning to trace the effects of the quantum fluctuations at the loop level and can not detect such an effect. We show that the action of the localized coherent states can be lowered such that the long range physics and the beta function are dominated by mini-instantons, i.e. instantons at the cut-off scale.

In our previous paper [5] the non linear sigma model was studied and a non-universal dependence of the beta function was found. But this result might have aroused from the fact that even the usual, large instanton gas is UV divergent in this model. The study of the four dimensional SU(2) gauge model where the usual instanton gas is UV finite demonstrates this genuinely new, cut-off independent tree level effect and brings us closer to an eventual phenomenological application of this phenomenon.

It is rather straightforward to show that the mini-instantons modify the scaling laws for topological observables by means of the dilute gas approximation. What remains an open question is to find out if the interactions between the instantons generate the same scaling laws for topological and non-topological observables.

In order to take into account the contributions of the saddle points in the vicinity of the cut-off one has to turn to the bare theory. So we start with the comparison of the renormalized and the bare perturbation expansions. The latter refers to a well defined large but finite dimensional path integral of the bare theory which is defined by the bare action, $S_B = S_{B0} + S_{B1}$,

$$Z = \int D[A] e^{-S_{B0}[A] - S_{B1}[A]} = \sum_n \frac{(-1)^n}{n!} \int D[A] e^{-S_{B0}[A]} (S_{B1}[A])^n. \quad (1)$$

The convergence of the expansion in the bare coupling constant, g_B^2 , usually turns out to be asymptotic only. Another problem of the expansion is that each order diverges with the cut-off and can not really be considered as small. The renormalized perturbation expansion is based on the observation that for the suitable fine tuned bare parameters the divergences cancel order by order and the resulting sum can be reorganized by means of a new, renormalized small parameter, $g_R^2(\mu)$, which is independent of the cut-off. To achieve this one splits the bare action into the renormalized and the counterterm parts, $S_B = S_{R0} + S_{R1} + S_{CT}$ and writes

$$Z = \sum_n \frac{(-1)^n}{n!} \int D[A] e^{-S_{R0}[A]} (S_{R1}[A] + S_{CT}[A])^n. \quad (2)$$

But note that $g_R^2(\mu)$ is constructed only *after* using the Wick theorem to find the cancellation between S_{R1} and S_{CT} . The expansion is formal because there is no well defined path integral with $g_R^2(\mu)$ as small parameter. The smallness of $g_R^2(\mu)$ is misleading because it hides the problem that its very existence requires the cancellation of divergences *after* expanding the bare integrand. The question of the convergence or the applicability of the expansion can only be investigated on the bare level.

The saddle point expansion is similar to the straightforward perturbation expansion from this point of view. The bare expansion starts with

$$Z = \sum_{A_{cl}^{(B)}} e^{-S_B[A_{cl}^{(B)}]} \int D[A] e^{-\frac{1}{2} A \left(\frac{\delta^2}{\delta A \delta A} S_B[A_{cl}^{(B)}] \right) A + O(A^3)}, \quad (3)$$

where $\frac{\delta S_B[A_{cl}^{(B)}]}{\delta A} = 0$ and continues with the expansion in the $O(A^3)$ pieces of the action. On the contrary, the renormalized saddle point expansion [8] uses S_R to select the saddle points and the rest of the action, S_{CT} , appears on the loop corrections only,

$$Z = \sum_{A_{cl}^{(R)}} e^{-S_R[A_{cl}^{(R)}]} \int D[A] e^{-\frac{1}{2} A \left(\frac{\delta^2}{\delta A \delta A} (S_R[A_{cl}^{(R)}] + S_{CT}[A_{cl}^{(R)}]) \right) A + O(A^3)}, \quad (4)$$

with the choice $\frac{\delta S_R[A_{cl}^{(R)}]}{\delta A} = 0$. The one-loop integral which arises by retaining the Gaussian part of the exponent of the integrand is divergent. If the saddle points are large, i.e. their size parameter is independent of the cut-off then the counterterms

needed to remove the divergences are the same as in the straightforward perturbation expansion because the instantons are locally flat.

But note that the configuration $A_{cl}^{(R)}$ is *not* an extremum of the complete integrand and (4) is incomplete, the correct expression which takes into account $S_{CT}[A]$ reads as

$$Z = \sum_{A_{cl}^{(R)}} e^{-S_R[A_{cl}^{(R)}] - S_{CT}[A_{cl}^{(R)}]} \times \int D[A] e^{-A \frac{\delta S_{CT}[A_{cl}^{(R)}]}{\delta A} - \frac{1}{2} A \left(\frac{\delta^2}{\delta A \delta A} (S_R[A_{cl}^{(R)}] + S_{CT}[A_{cl}^{(R)}]) \right) A + O(A^3)}. \quad (5)$$

The difference between (4) and (5) is that the tree level scale dependence of $S_{CT}[A]$ is retained in the latter. Is this really important? One would think that for an asymptotically free theory like the Yang-Mills system $S_R[A] \gg S_{CT}[A]$ and the tree level scale dependence is not important. In fact, one has

$$S_R[A] = -\frac{1}{4g_R^2(\mu)} \int d^4x (F_{\mu\nu}^a)^2, \quad (6)$$

$$S_{CT}[A] = -\frac{\beta_0}{2} \ln \frac{\Lambda}{\mu} \int d^4x (F_{\mu\nu}^a)^2, \quad (7)$$

with $\beta_0 = \frac{22}{3} \frac{1}{16\pi^2}$ in dimensional regularization what yields

$$\frac{1}{g_B^2} = \frac{1}{g_R^2(\Lambda)} = \frac{1}{g^2(\mu)} + \beta_0 \ln \frac{\Lambda^2}{\mu^2}, \quad (8)$$

and consequently

$$\frac{1}{g^2(\mu)} \gg \beta_0 \ln \frac{\Lambda^2}{\mu^2}. \quad (9)$$

The problem with this argument is that (7) is incorrect. The scale dependence which is given by the logarithmic expression in (7) comes from the one-loop level. The analytical regularization provides the cut-off for the loop integration without having it at the tree level where the actual path integral is defined. It is obvious that $S_{CT}[A]$ must be scale dependent since it is an irrelevant operator with the role to suppress the high energy modes. The scale factor μ in (7) comes from the loop integration and is actually the characteristic scale of the configuration A and can not be considered as an independent parameter in (7). Due to the lack of the tree level scale dependence in (7) (9) does not imply $S_R[A] \gg S_{CT}[A]$. The summary: The dimensional regularization is inconsistent in the presence of a nonhomogeneous background field because it provides the scale dependence only for the quantum fluctuations and not for the tree level action. A mathematically well defined regulator which yields a large but finite dimensional integral, (3), must regulate the whole path integral, both at the tree and the loop orders.

This problem is obvious in lattice regularization when $S_R[A]$ is chosen to be the classical action in the IR regime, i.e. classical continuum action. The lattice and the continuum action agree for slowly varying field configurations but differ significantly when the characteristic length scale of the configuration is close to the lattice spacing. It is just this tree level scale dependence what serves as the regulator.

There is another reason why the tree level contribution of the counterterms is important in four dimensional Yang-Mills theories. Since the renormalized action is scale invariant its saddle points, $A_{cl}^{(R)}$, are degenerate when the tree level scale dependence of $S_{CT}[A]$ is ignored. But one should bear in mind that an infinitesimally weak splitting of an infinitely degenerate situation can be important because it may induce non-analytic behavior as it is well known from the quantum Hall effect.

We know now other consistent regularization method than putting the theory on the lattice. The difficulties of the analytical approach in lattice regularization forces one to find a compromise, namely a variant of the renormalized action where the counterterms have less role to play. In such a theory the renormalized expansion is more reliable. In particular, we suggest the use of higher power of the derivatives in the renormalized lagrangian. The new pieces will render the higher loop contributions finite so the counterterm will be needed for the one-loop graphs only.

We shall consider two versions of SU(2) gauge theories which differ in regularization only. One is given in the continuum by the action with higher order derivatives,

$$L_{ext} = -\frac{1}{4g_B^2} F_{\mu\nu}^a \left(1 + \frac{c_2}{\Lambda^2} D^2 + \frac{c_4}{\Lambda^4} (D^2)^2 \right) F^{a\mu\nu} \quad (10)$$

where $c_\alpha > 0$ and D is the covariant derivative. (10) is not the complete bare lagrangian as it stands because the higher order derivative terms do not remove the one-loop divergences. One can use Pauli-Villars regularization [9], $L_B = L_{ext} + L_{PV}$, where L_{PV} stands for the lagrangian of the regulator particle of mass $M^2 = O(\Lambda^2)$ to render the one-loop structure finite. The contribution of states with negative norm can not be treated consistently in the path integral because the Gaussian integral diverges exponentially. The usual remedy of this problem is to consider the analytical continuation of the free generator functional and to change the sign of the propagator for the regulator particle. The tree level contribution of the regulator is lost in this manner and only the loop contributions are retained from L_{PV} . Our point is that choosing $L_R = L_{ext}$ and $L_{CT} = L_{PV}$ in the renormalized saddle point expansion yields better results with $c_\alpha \neq 0$ than with $c_\alpha = 0$. This is because all higher loop contributions are finite for L_{ext} and the non-consistency comes from the terms which influence the tree and one-loop level only.

Another regularization we shall consider is to put the theory on a space-time lattice with $\Lambda = \frac{2\pi}{a}$. The higher order derivative terms give rise Wilson loops up to the length of $3a$ in the lattice action $L_B = L_{lat}$. The theory is fully regulated but not well suited to the analytical methods.

The theory (10) possesses saddle points which become self dual instantons for $c_\alpha = 0$. According to the dimensional argument the tree level instanton action must be of the form

$$\frac{1}{g^2} S_{ext}(\rho\Lambda) = \frac{1}{g^2} S_0 \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{c}_2}{\rho^2 \Lambda^2} + \frac{\tilde{c}_4}{\rho^4 \Lambda^4} \right) \quad (11)$$

where $S_0 = 8\pi^2$ is the scale independent usual instanton action. ρ is the scale parameter of the instanton configuration $A_\mu^{(c_\alpha, \rho)}(x)$ and $\tilde{c}_\alpha = O(c_\alpha)$. The scale parameter ρ is introduced in a somehow arbitrary fashion by requiring that $A_\mu^{(c_\alpha, \rho)}(x)$ be a self dual instanton with size ρ for $c_\alpha = 0$. But it is only the actual relation between c_α and \tilde{c}_α which depends on the details of introducing the scale parameter. We change the notation slightly now and the $\frac{1}{g^2}$ will be factorized out from the action in the rest of

the paper. The stable saddle point corresponds to an instanton at the scale of the cut-off,

$$\bar{\rho} = \frac{1}{\Lambda} \sqrt{\frac{2\tilde{c}_4}{\tilde{c}_2}}, \quad (12)$$

with action

$$\bar{S}_{ext} = S_0 \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{c}_2^2}{4\tilde{c}_4} \right). \quad (13)$$

Since $S_{ext}(\rho\Lambda)$ has vanishing curvature at its minimum there is no restoring force for the small fluctuations in ρ . Consequently ρ will be used to parametrize a one parameter family of configurations to be treated by the collective coordinate method in the path integration even when the tree level scale invariance is removed by $c_\alpha \neq 0$.

The scale parameter can be introduced in lattice regularization, too. By the help of some well defined but not unique procedure one can define interpolating field in the continuum which gives the desired link variables. The scale parameter is then introduced for the interpolating field. The cut-off dependence in the fully regulated lattice action prevents us from obtaining a simple expression for the instanton action $S_{lat}(\rho\Lambda)$. The tree level matching of the two regularizations gives

$$S_{lat}(\rho\Lambda) = S_{ext}(\rho\Lambda) \left(1 + O((\rho\Lambda)^{-2}) \right). \quad (14)$$

We are interested in lattice theories which are similar to the case of $c_\alpha > 0$ i.e. where $S_{lat}(\rho\Lambda)$ reaches the minimum value \bar{S}_{lat} at $\bar{\rho} = O(\Lambda^{-1})$.

Let us compute the ratio of the partition function in the unit and the zero winding number sector in the one-loop approximation,

$$\frac{Z_1}{Z_0} = \frac{C}{g^{n_0}} \int d^4 R \int_0^{\frac{1}{\mu}} \frac{d\rho}{\rho^5} e^{-\frac{1}{g^2} S(\rho\Lambda)} \mathcal{D}(\rho\Lambda), \quad (15)$$

where n_0 is the number of modes treated by the help of the collective coordinate method and \mathcal{D} stands for the contribution of the fluctuation determinant. C is a numerical constant whose value is of no importance for us. The infrared catastrophe is ignored by the introduction of the infrared cut-off, $\mu = O(\Lambda_{QCD})$. Four inverse power of the scale parameter in the integrand is to give the correct entropy, i.e. number of time an instanton with size ρ can be placed into the quantization volume $V = \int d^4 R$. We shall compute (15) for the Pauli-Villars and the lattice regulated theory.

In the Pauli-Villars regulated continuum theory the translation in space-time is a zero mode together with the global gauge transformations so

$$\left(\frac{Z_1}{Z_0} \right)_{PV} = C \frac{V}{g^8} \int_0^{\frac{1}{\mu}} \frac{d\rho}{\rho^5} e^{-\frac{S_0}{g^2} \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{c}_2}{\rho^2 \Lambda^2} + \frac{\tilde{c}_4}{\rho^4 \Lambda^4} \right)} \mathcal{D}_{PV}(\rho\Lambda). \quad (16)$$

The collective coordinates, R^μ and ρ , are introduced in lattice regularization to monitor the continuous space-time translations and the scale transformation of the interpolating field configuration, respectively. The continuous translational symmetry is broken in the lattice regulated theory. The instanton action, $S_{lat}(\rho\Lambda, R^\mu\Lambda)$, and the fluctuation determinant, $\mathcal{D}_{lat}(\rho\Lambda, R^\mu\Lambda)$, become nontrivial functions of the translation with period length $\frac{2\pi}{\Lambda}$. Since it is sufficient to make the integration over the translations

within the hypercube of the size of the period length one finds for the lattice volume N^4 ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{Z_1}{Z_0}\right)_{lat} &= C \frac{N^4}{g^8} \int d^4 R \int_0^{\frac{1}{\mu}} \frac{d\rho}{\rho^5} e^{-\frac{1}{g^2} S_{lat}(\rho\Lambda, R^\mu\Lambda)} \mathcal{D}_{lat}(\rho\Lambda, R^\mu\Lambda) \\ &= C \frac{V}{g^8} \int_0^{\frac{1}{\mu}} \frac{d\rho}{\rho^5} e^{-\frac{1}{g^2} S_{lat}(\rho\Lambda)} \mathcal{D}_{lat}(\rho\Lambda), \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where the space time averaging is made implicit by the introduction of $S_{lat}(\rho\Lambda)$ and $\mathcal{D}_{lat}(\rho\Lambda)$,

$$\left(\frac{2\pi}{\Lambda}\right)^4 e^{-\frac{1}{g^2} S_{lat}(\rho\Lambda)} = \int d^4 R e^{-\frac{1}{g^2} S_{lat}(\rho\Lambda, R^\mu\Lambda)}. \quad (18)$$

and

$$\left(\frac{2\pi}{\Lambda}\right)^4 e^{-\frac{1}{g^2} S_{lat}(\rho\Lambda)} \mathcal{D}_{lat}(\rho\Lambda) = \int d^4 R e^{-\frac{1}{g^2} S_{lat}(\rho\Lambda, R^\mu\Lambda)} \mathcal{D}_{lat}(\rho\Lambda, R^\mu\Lambda). \quad (19)$$

The contribution of instantons as the function of the size parameter has a well pronounced peak at $\rho \approx \bar{\rho}$. Another important region is in the infrared where the loop correction increase. In order to separate the contribution of the large, i.e. cut-off independent instantons from that of the stable saddle point in the vicinity of the cut-off we split the scale integration into two parts by the help of a scale parameter m , $\Lambda_{QCD} \ll m \ll \Lambda$,

$$\int_0^{\frac{1}{\mu}} d\rho \dots = \int_0^{\frac{1}{m}} d\rho \dots + \int_{\frac{1}{m}}^{\frac{1}{\mu}} d\rho \dots. \quad (20)$$

The first and the second integral will be referred as the contribution of the mini and the large instantons, respectively.

Large instantons:

$$\left(\frac{Z_1}{Z_0}\right)_{PV,large} = C \frac{V}{g^8} \int_{\frac{1}{m}}^{\frac{1}{\mu}} \frac{d\rho}{\rho^5} e^{-\frac{S_0}{g^2} \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{c}_2}{\rho^2 \Lambda^2} + \frac{\tilde{c}_4}{\rho^4 \Lambda^4}\right)} \mathcal{D}_{PV}(\rho\Lambda). \quad (21)$$

In this case $\rho^2 \Lambda^2 \gg 1$ and we can neglect the terms multiplying \tilde{c}_α in the exponential. Moreover the quantum fluctuation determinant is $\mathcal{D}_{PV}(\rho\Lambda) = c_{PV}(\rho\Lambda)^{\frac{22}{3}}$ in this regime. We finally obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{Z_1}{Z_0}\right)_{PV,large} &= C_{PV} \frac{V}{g^8} \int_{\frac{1}{m}}^{\frac{1}{\mu}} \frac{d\rho}{\rho^5} e^{-\frac{S_0}{g^2}} (\rho\Lambda)^{\frac{22}{3}} \\ &= \frac{3}{10} C_{PV} \frac{V \Lambda^4}{g^8} e^{-\frac{S_0}{g^2}} \left[\left(\frac{\Lambda}{\mu}\right)^{\frac{10}{3}} - \left(\frac{\Lambda}{m}\right)^{\frac{10}{3}} \right] \\ &\sim \frac{3}{10} C_{PV} \frac{V \Lambda^4}{g^8} e^{-\frac{S_0}{g^2}} \left(\frac{\Lambda}{\mu}\right)^{\frac{10}{3}}, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where $C_{PV} = C c_{PV}$.

In lattice regularization we use (14) and

$$\mathcal{D}_{lat}(\rho\Lambda) = \mathcal{D}_{PV}(\rho\Lambda) \left(c_{lat} + O((\rho\Lambda)^{-2}) \right), \quad (23)$$

to arrive at

$$\left(\frac{Z_1}{Z_0}\right)_{lat,large} \sim \frac{3}{10} C_{lat} \frac{V\Lambda^4}{g^8} e^{-\frac{S_0}{g^2}} \left(\frac{\Lambda}{\mu}\right)^{\frac{10}{3}}, \quad (24)$$

with $C_{lat} = C_{PV} c_{lat}$.
Mini-instantons:

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{Z_1}{Z_0}\right)_{PV,mini} &= C \frac{V}{g^8} \int_0^{\frac{1}{m}} \frac{d\rho}{\rho^5} e^{-\frac{S_0}{g^2} \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{c}_2}{\rho^2 \Lambda^2} + \frac{\tilde{c}_4}{\rho^4 \Lambda^4}\right)} \mathcal{D}_{PV}(\rho\Lambda) \\ &= C \frac{V}{g^8} e^{-\frac{S_0}{g^2} \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{c}_2^2}{4\tilde{c}_4}\right)} \int_0^{\frac{1}{m}} \frac{d\rho}{\rho^5} e^{-\frac{S_0}{g^2} \tilde{c}_4 \left(\frac{1}{\rho^2 \Lambda^2} - \frac{1}{\bar{\rho}^2 \Lambda^2}\right)^2} \mathcal{D}_{PV}(\rho\Lambda) \\ &= C \frac{V}{g^8} e^{-\frac{1}{g^2} \bar{S}_{ext}} \int_{m^2}^{\infty} d\left(\frac{1}{\rho^2}\right) \frac{1}{\rho^2} \mathcal{D}_{PV}(\rho\Lambda) e^{-\frac{S_0}{g^2} \tilde{c}_4 \left(\frac{1}{\rho^2 \Lambda^2} - \frac{1}{\bar{\rho}^2 \Lambda^2}\right)^2} \\ &\sim C \frac{V\Lambda^4}{g^8} e^{-\frac{1}{g^2} \bar{S}_{ext}} \frac{\mathcal{D}_{PV}(\bar{\rho}\Lambda)}{\bar{\rho}^2 \Lambda^2} \sqrt{\frac{\pi g^2}{S_0 \tilde{c}_4}} \\ &= C \frac{V\Lambda^4}{g^8} e^{-\frac{1}{g^2} \bar{S}_{ext}} \mathcal{D}_{PV}(\bar{\rho}\Lambda) \sqrt{\frac{\tilde{c}_2^2}{4\tilde{c}_4^3} \frac{g^2}{8\pi}} \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Similar steps followed in the lattice regularized model yield

$$\left(\frac{Z_1}{Z_0}\right)_{lat,mini} \sim C \frac{V\Lambda^4}{g^8} e^{-\frac{1}{g^2} \bar{S}_{lat}} \mathcal{D}_{lat}(\bar{\rho}\Lambda) \left(\frac{1}{g^2} \frac{d^2 S_{lat}(\bar{\rho}\Lambda)}{d(1/(\rho\Lambda)^2)^2}\right)^{-1/2}. \quad (26)$$

Note that both the large and mini instanton contributions are well defined since they are independent of the choice of m .

Finally we take the limit $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$ by keeping a renormalization condition fulfilled for each relevant coupling constant. Suppose that the usual scenario holds, namely that F^2 is the only relevant operator, (8) is valid, $\frac{S_0}{g^2(\Lambda)} = \frac{22}{3} \ln\left(\frac{\Lambda}{\Lambda_{PV}}\right)$, and c_α are irrelevant so need no renormalization. The renormalization condition to fix g^2 will be chosen as

$$\Lambda \frac{d}{d\Lambda} \frac{Z_1}{Z_0} = 0. \quad (27)$$

In the limit $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$ either the large or the mini instantons dominate the partition function. In order to see this we compute their relative weight,

$$\begin{aligned} R_{PV} &= \frac{\left(\frac{Z_1}{Z_0}\right)_{PV,large}}{\left(\frac{Z_1}{Z_0}\right)_{PV,mini}} = \frac{3}{10} \frac{e^{-\frac{S_0}{g^2}} \left(\frac{\Lambda}{\mu}\right)^{\frac{10}{3}}}{e^{-\frac{S_0}{g^2} \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{c}_2^2}{4\tilde{c}_4}\right)} \mathcal{D}_{PV}(\bar{\rho}\Lambda) \sqrt{\frac{\tilde{c}_2^2}{4\tilde{c}_4^3} \frac{g^2}{8\pi}}} \\ &= \text{Const} \times \ln \frac{\Lambda}{\Lambda_{PV}} \left(\frac{\Lambda_{PV}}{\mu}\right)^{\frac{22}{3} \left(1 - \frac{\bar{S}_{ext}}{S_0}\right)} \left(\frac{\Lambda}{\mu}\right)^{\frac{2}{3} \left(11 \frac{\bar{S}_{ext}}{S_0} - 6\right)}. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

For $\bar{S}_{ext} < S_0 \frac{6}{11}$ the mini-instantons dominate the partition function.

For the lattice regulated theory where $\frac{S_0}{g^2} = \frac{22}{3} \ln\left(\frac{\Lambda}{\Lambda_{lat}}\right)$ we find

$$R_{lat} = \text{Const} \times \ln \frac{\Lambda}{\Lambda_{lat}} \left(\frac{\Lambda_{lat}}{\mu}\right)^{\frac{22}{3} \left(1 - \frac{\bar{S}_{lat}}{S_0}\right)} \left(\frac{\Lambda}{\mu}\right)^{\frac{2}{3} \left(11 \frac{\bar{S}_{lat}}{S_0} - 6\right)}. \quad (29)$$

The mini-instantons dominate if $\bar{S}_{lat} < S_0 \frac{6}{11}$.

Our renormalization condition, (27), can be written in the large instanton dominated region in the leading order by ignoring the power dependence in g^2 as

$$\Lambda \frac{d}{d\Lambda} \left(\Lambda^{\frac{22}{3}} e^{-\frac{1}{g^2} S_0} \right) = \left(\frac{22}{3} + \frac{2S_0}{g^3} \beta(g) \right) \Lambda^{\frac{22}{3}} e^{-\frac{1}{g^2} S_0} = 0. \quad (30)$$

Thus we find $\Lambda \frac{d}{d\Lambda} g = \beta(g) = -\frac{11}{3S_0} g^3$, which is the first universal term of the usual beta function. This is by no means surprising, since the ultraviolet structure is the same on the flat or the large instanton background.

In the case of the mini-instantons the fluctuation determinant is cut-off independent and the remaining pieces of the renormalization condition yield

$$\Lambda \frac{d}{d\Lambda} \left(\Lambda^4 e^{-\frac{1}{g^2} \bar{S}} \right) = \left(4 + \frac{2\bar{S}}{g^3} \beta(g) \right) \Lambda^4 e^{-\frac{1}{g^2} \bar{S}} = 0, \quad (31)$$

in either regularization. Thus we arrive at a different result, $\Lambda \frac{d}{d\Lambda} g = -\frac{2}{5} g^3$.

What we found is that either c_α are relevant and need renormalization or the beta function for g is non-universal in the mini-instanton dominated phase of the theory. This conclusion depends crucially on the renormalization condition, (27). This equation seems reasonable in the large instanton case but one may object that Z_1/Z_0 is unimportant in the mini-instanton phase. In fact, Z_1 is saturated by a mini-instanton and these configurations should not be important for observables such as Wilson loops at finite length scale. But this argument to exclude mini-instantons from the renormalization process is too superficial.

One can distinguish two different classes of observables in gauge theories. The first class contains the quantities with non-topological origin, such as the Wilson loops. The second class consists of observables which depend on the topological properties of the configuration, such as the topological charge, mass of the η' meson or the Green functions for massless fermions. These quantities are discontinuous, locally constant step functional of the gauge field. The mini-instantons play no direct role in determining the value of an observable of the first class when this latter it is evaluated on a single gauge field configuration. This is because the configuration becomes pure gauge too fast as we move away from the instanton and gives negligible contribution to large Wilson loops. But the ratio between the instanton size and the length scale of the observable is irrelevant in case of the topological quantities and mini-instantons influence the observables of the second class. In fact, the topological properties such as winding numbers can be read off from the boundary conditions in space-time, infinitely far from the source of the nontrivial topological structure. For example the chiral condensate measured in the infrared limit contains the contribution of instantons at all length scale. The dilute instanton gas picture suggests that this feature, namely the unimportance or importance of mini-instantons for observables in the first or second class, respectively, remains valid after averaging over the configurations. If this is true then we can not remove the cut-off by keeping both classes convergent in the mini-instanton phase because they require different beta functions.

But this is certainly an oversimplification suggested by the dilute instanton gas picture where the topological structure and the dynamics are largely unrelated. The interaction between mini-instantons may modify the long range structure in a manner what is similar to the effect of polarization in classical electrodynamics of continuous media. There are two possibilities: (i) The topological properties are lost during the

renormalization and the beta function of the theory is given by the non-topological observables. (ii) The topology is preserved as the cut-off is removed and the instanton-instanton interactions generate a uniform beta function what keeps both kind of observables finite. Thus the actual renormalization of the theory requires a more detailed computation than the dilute gas approximation in the mini-instanton phase. It is sufficient to mention here the result of Ref. [6] where the SU(2) lattice gauge model with higher order derivatives was studied and it has been found that the vacuum becomes a crystal of frustrations when the action may take values below those of the trivial vacuum. This crystal serves as an example to demonstrate that the strong correlations between the localized saddle points may generate new phase diagram and scaling law.

Our simple classification of the observables presented above is straightforward in the continuum where the topological properties of the space-time are explicit. But the difference between the topological sectors is washed away in lattice regularization because the consistent regularization removes the singularities even on the tree level. The mini-instantons display topological effects on the lattice only if they are larger than the lattice spacing, $\bar{\rho} > \ell_0/\Lambda$. The important point is that this condition can be satisfied by a cut-off independent choice of $\bar{\rho}\Lambda$. In other words, for the appropriate choice of c_α the mini-instanton size is few order or magnitude larger than the lattice spacing but remains proportional with it. The scaling properties of such a theory are non-universal.

One can not keep the topological and the non-topological observables fixed during the renormalization in the mini-instanton phase unless the correlation between the instantons is taken into account. Thus all one can say at this time is that the universality for topological quantities like the η' mass is not yet established in QCD. We may take lattice QCD with Wilson action as an example where there is no stable instanton solutions but the small instanton action is so low that the topological susceptibility diverges. By the help of adding larger Wilson loops to the action we may generate sufficiently large mini-instantons and the universality becomes questionable.

REFERENCES

- [1] K. Wilson and J. Kogut, *Phys. Rep.***12 C** (1974) 75 ; K. Wilson, *Rev. Mod. Phys.***47** (1975) 773.
- [2] S. B. Liao, J. Polonyi, *Phys. Rev.***D51** (1955) 4474.
- [3] C.N. Leung, S.T. Love and William A. Bardeen, *Nucl. Phys.***B 323** (1989) 493 ; C.N. Leung, S.T. Love and William A. Bardeen, *Nucl. Phys.***B273** (1986) 649.
- [4] P.I. Fomin, V.P. Gusynin and V.A. Miranski, *Phys. Lett.***78B** (1978) 136; V. A. Miransky, *Dynamical Symmetry Breaking in Quantum Field Theories*, Singapore, World Scientific, 1994.
- [5] V. Branchina, J. Polonyi, *Nucl. Phys.*(1955) 99.
- [6] J. Fingberg and J. Polonyi, "Anti-Ferromagnetic Condensate in Yang-Mills Theory", hep-lat/9602003, submitted to *Nucl. Phys.*.
- [7] T. Appelquist, J. Carazzone, *Phys. Rev.***D11** (1975) 2856.
- [8] G. 't Hooft, *Phys. Rev.***D 14** (1976) 3432; A. Polyakov, *Nucl. Phys.***B 120** (1977) 429.
- [9] T. D. Bakeev and A. A. Slavnov, "Higher Covariant Derivative Regularization Revisited", hep-th/9601092.